

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

DEETTA BRIGHT,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO:

-VS-

CREDIT ACCEPTANCE  
CORPORATION,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**COMPLAINT**

1. Plaintiff alleges violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. §227 *et seq.* (“TCPA”).

**INTRODUCTION**

2. The TCPA was enacted to prevent companies like CREDIT ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION, (hereinafter “CAC” or “Defendant”), from invading American citizens’ privacy and prevent abusive “robo-calls.”

3. “The TCPA is designed to protect individual consumers from receiving intrusive and unwanted telephone calls.” *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, --US--, 132 S.Ct. 740, 745, 181 L.Ed.2d 881 (2012).

4. “No one can deny the legitimacy of the state’s goal: Preventing the phone (at home or in one’s pocket) from frequently ringing with unwanted calls. Every call uses some of the phone owner’s time and mental energy, both of which are precious. Most members of the

public want to limit calls, especially cellphone calls, to family and acquaintances, and to get their political information (not to mention their advertisements) [\*6] in other ways.” *Patriotic Veterans v. Zoeller*, No. 16-2059, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 47, at \*5-6 (7th Cir. Jan 3, 2017).

5. “Senator Hollings, the TCPA’s sponsor, described these calls as ‘the **\*1256** scourge of modern civilization, they wake us up in the morning; they interrupt our dinner at night; they force the sick and elderly out of bed; they hound us until we want to rip the telephone out of the wall.’ 137 Cong. Rec. 30, 821 (1991). Senator Hollings presumably intended to give telephone subscribers another option: telling the autodialers to simply stop calling.” *Osorio v. State Farm Bank, F.S.B.*, 746 F. 3d 1242 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014).

6. According to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), “Unwanted calls are far and away the biggest consumer complaint to the FCC with over 200,000 complaints each year – around 60 percent of all the complaints...Some private analyses estimate that U.S. consumers received approximately 2.4 billion robocalls per month in 2016.” *The FCC’s Push to Combat Robocalls & Spoofing* (website visited on Jan. 2, 2019), <https://www.fcc.gov/about-fcc/fcc-initiatives/fccs-push-combat-robocalls-spoofing>.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7. Jurisdiction and venue for purposes of this action are appropriate and conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 1331, Federal Question Jurisdiction, as this action involves violations of the TCPA.

8. Subject matter jurisdiction, federal question jurisdiction, for purposes of this action is appropriate and conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which provides that the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States; and this action involves violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii). See

*Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, S.Ct. 740, 748 (2012) and *Osorio v. State Farm Bank, F.S.B.*, 746 F.3d 1242, 1249 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014).

9. The alleged violations described herein occurred in Genesee County, Michigan. Accordingly, venue is appropriate with this Court under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2), as it is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this action occurred.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10. Plaintiff is a natural person, and citizen of the State of Michigan, residing in Flint, Genesee County, Michigan.

11. Plaintiff is the “called party.” See *Breslow v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 755 F. 3d 1265 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014) and *Osorio v. State Farm Bank, F.S.B.*, 746 F.3d 1242 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2014).

12. Defendant is a corporation with its principal place of business at 25505 West Twelve Mile Road, Southfield, MI 48034, and conducts business in the State of Michigan.

13. Plaintiff is the regular user and carrier of the cellular telephone number at issue, (313) \*\*\* - 3767, and was the called party and recipient of Defendant’s hereinafter described calls.

14. Since the creation of the account, Plaintiff began receiving calls to her aforementioned cellular telephone from Defendant seeking to recover an alleged debt related to an auto loan.

15. Upon information and belief, some or all of the calls the Defendant made to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number were made using an “automatic telephone dialing system” which has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, without human

intervention, using a random or sequential number generator (including but not limited to a predictive dialer) or an artificial or prerecorded voice; and to dial such numbers as specified by 47 U.S.C § 227(a)(1) (hereinafter “autodialer calls”).

16. Plaintiff will testify that she knew it was an autodialer because of the vast number of calls she received and because when she answered a call from the Defendant she would hear a prerecorded message stating the call was from Credit Acceptance and to please hold the line for the next available representative.

17. Furthermore, some or all of the calls at issue were placed by the Defendant using a “prerecorded voice,” as specified by the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

18. None of Defendant’s telephone calls placed to Plaintiff were for “emergency purposes” as specified in 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A).

19. Defendant attempted to collect a debt from the Plaintiff by this campaign of telephone calls.

20. In or about December of 2017, Plaintiff answered a call from the Defendant, met with an automated message, eventually was connected to a live representative, and informed the agent/representative of Defendant that she had unfortunately experienced a decrease in her income, she was doing everything she could to keep up with her payments, she would call Defendant when she was able to pay, and demanded that the Defendant cease placing calls to her aforementioned cellular telephone number.

21. During the aforementioned phone conversation in or about December of 2017 with Defendant’s agent/representative, Plaintiff unequivocally revoked any express consent Defendant may have had for placement of telephone calls to Plaintiff’s aforementioned cellular

telephone number by the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or a pre-recorded or artificial voice.

22. Each subsequent call the Defendant made to the Plaintiff's aforementioned cellular telephone number was done so without the "express consent" of the Plaintiff.

23. Each subsequent call the Defendant made to the Plaintiff's aforementioned cellular telephone number was knowing and/or willful.

24. Additionally, on or about June 12, 2018, due to the continued automated calls to her cell phone, Plaintiff faxed a letter to Defendant requesting that Defendant no longer call her cell phone or contact her directly in any way, including by phone or written correspondence. Plaintiff went on to send this same letter via certified mail on June 18, 2018. See attached **Exhibit A**.

25. Despite actual knowledge of their wrongdoing, the Defendant continued the campaign of abuse, calling the Plaintiff despite the Plaintiff revoking any express consent the Defendant may have had to call her aforementioned cellular telephone number.

26. On at least five (5) separate occasions, Plaintiff has demanded that Defendant cease placing calls to her aforementioned cellular telephone number.

27. Each of the Plaintiff's requests for the harassment to end was ignored.

28. From about December of 2017 through the filing of this Complaint, Defendant has placed approximately four hundred (400) actionable calls to Plaintiff's aforementioned cellular telephone number.

29. From each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone, Plaintiff suffered the injury of invasion of privacy and the intrusion upon her right of seclusion.

30. From each and every call without express consent placed by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone, Plaintiff suffered the injury of the occupation of her cellular telephone line and cellular phone by unwelcome calls, making the phone unavailable for legitimate callers or outgoing calls while the phone was ringing from Defendant's calls.

31. From each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone, Plaintiff suffered the injury of unnecessary expenditure of her time. Plaintiff had to waste time to deal with missed call notifications and call logs that reflect the unwanted calls. This also impaired the usefulness of these features of Plaintiff's cellular phone, which are designed to inform the user of important missed communications.

32. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone was an injury in the form of a nuisance and annoyance to the Plaintiff. For calls that were answered, Plaintiff had to go through the unnecessary trouble of answering them. Even for unanswered calls, Plaintiff had to deal with missed call notifications and call logs that reflected the unwanted calls. This also impaired the usefulness of these features of Plaintiff's cellular phone, which are designed to inform the user of important missed communications.

33. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone resulted in the injury of unnecessary expenditure of Plaintiff's cell phone's battery power.

34. Each and every call placed without express consent by Defendant to Plaintiff's cell phone resulted in the injury of a trespass to Plaintiff's chattel, namely her cellular phone and her cellular phone services.

35. As a result of the calls described above, Plaintiff suffered an invasion of privacy. Plaintiff was also affected in a personal and individualized way by stress, anxiety, embarrassment, and aggravation.

36. Defendant's corporate policy is structured so as to continue to call individuals like the Plaintiff, despite these individuals explaining to Defendant they do not wish to be called.

37. Defendant's corporate policy provided no means for Plaintiff to have Plaintiff's number removed from Defendant's call list.

38. Defendant has numerous other federal lawsuits pending against them alleging similar violations as stated in this Complaint.

39. Defendant has numerous complaints against it across the country asserting that its automatic telephone dialing system continues to call despite being requested to stop.

40. Defendant has had numerous complaints against it from consumers across the country asking to not be called; however, Defendant continues to call these individuals.

41. Defendant violated the TCPA with respect to the Plaintiff.

42. Defendant willfully and/or knowingly violated the TCPA with respect to the Plaintiff.

**COUNT I**  
**(Violation of the TCPA)**

43. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates paragraphs one (1) through forty-two (42) above as if fully set forth herein.

44. Defendant willfully violated the TCPA with respect to Plaintiff, specifically for each of the auto-dialer calls made to Plaintiff's cellular telephone after Plaintiff notified Defendant that Plaintiff did not wish to receive any telephone communication from Defendant, and demanded for the calls to stop.

45. Defendant repeatedly placed non-emergency telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone using an automatic telephone dialing system or prerecorded or artificial voice without Plaintiff's prior express consent in violation of federal law, including 47 U.S.C § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff respectfully demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable and judgment against CREDIT ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION for statutory damages, treble damages, punitive damages, actual damages and any other such relief the court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Octavio Gomez

OCTAVIO GOMEZ, ESQUIRE

Florida Bar No.: 0338620

MORGAN & MORGAN, TAMPA, P.A.

201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor

Tampa, FL 33602

Telephone: (813) 223-5505

Facsimile: (813) 223-5402

Email: TGomez@ForThePeople.com

Secondary: SHill@ForThePeople.com

SLauredan@ForThePeople.com

*Attorney for Plaintiff*